

when it has two such facts before it, workmen opposing machinery and workmen insisting on machinery, the obvious conclusion is that it isn't the machinery, but it is changing methods, changing habits, that they object to. When we have been doing things in a certain way and all of a sudden somebody comes along with a new proposition he is proposing a revolution in our habits. Human nature safeguards itself against revolution by being afraid of change. Prove it to us first. The manager ought to know that a wage earner who appears to be opposing machinery, is opposed to change primarily and not to the machine.

You know, we seem to have an idea in studying things scientifically, that everything in the world is natural and works according to certain natural laws if we can only study them and find them out. We think human beings, however, are not natural. But psychologists have shown us that we can study the actions of human beings and record what they do and classify that knowledge; and we find that they also act in accordance with certain natural laws, natural habits, natural methods of doing things. If we want to get a certain result from people, we must study scientifically, not primarily the thing that we want to get over to them, but the method of getting it over. We must study our people, how they act and react so that we may be able to present the problem properly to them.

Let me illustrate by cases that come before our court. Dr. Jacobstein has told you that in this industry in Rochester, the predominating nationalities are Jews and Italians. Jews and Italians have altogether different psychology and you cannot make them understand the same proposition by putting it to them in the same way.

I note them coming to the court. The Jews don't care a hang about decisions at all. They don't want decisions. When they get stuck in negotiating with the employer they come to the court to get assistance so that they may continue the negotiations and reach an agreement. They want to bargain and adjust the matter. They have a bargaining psychology; years of that kind of tradition back of them. They say: "The price of this is fifty cents," and they think it ought to be that. The employer says: "It is only forty cents." They know full well the workers are not lying; they know that they have put the price higher with the expectation of bargaining. That isn't lying. That is business.

The Italians have quite a different psychology. They haven't had so many years of business experience. Theirs is not a business psychology. They haven't any bargaining instincts. Their psychology is rather, as it appears in court, that of a sense of honor, handed down from days of chivalry. If an Italian says this is worth fifty cents, even though he may have made a slip and it really isn't worth fifty cents, he doesn't look upon the statement as a bargaining bid. When, therefore, the other fellow says it is worth only forty cents he thinks the other man is calling him a liar. And he does not want to negotiate. He comes to the judge and asks: "Am I right or am I wrong?" And he will stand for any decision that an outsider will give. He wants the outsider to settle this affair of honor between him and the other man. He doesn't want the other man to tell him he is wrong, and he doesn't care particularly about bargaining the matter. He wants to be told whether he is right or wrong: "Am I a liar or am I not a liar when I say this is worth fifty cents?"

It is quite obvious that if you try to deal with both of those sets of people in the same way, no matter what it is that you want to get over, you are going to get different kinds of results, and the manager who doesn't understand the different psychologies of the people he is working with is not going to get his results over.

The union people, those who survive in the union membership as leaders, or officers of the union, are the best people to study when it comes to finding out the real science of management; because in order to survive as leaders they have to make their own working people, who are their employers, do the things that the officials see they have to do under the agreement, and yet they must convince the working people from their point of view.

I will tell you an experience of the manager of the union here, how he managed a very radical shop chairman in order to get a certain result from him. It illustrates in a homely way the method of really managing,—with an understanding of psychology. If you told this union man that he was applying psychology he would say you were crazy, but that is what he is doing.

There was a dispute between a certain section of button sewers and the firm, and the decision was made. A half dozen girls didn't want to work according to the decision, and this radical shop chair-

man and some others had encouraged them, and said: "Go out, the rest of us will support you," or something to that effect. The firm did very promptly what it should have done when the girls refused to do the work,—fired them. After the girls were out two or three days they saw that the men who had encouraged them didn't come across. There wasn't any stoppage or strike to support them at all. The union wouldn't stand for it. So the girls were left out in the cold and the shop chairman felt a little guilty that he had in some way encouraged them and then he didn't keep his word. He and several others asked that the girls be taken back; the firm refused. Then there grew up quite a little sentiment among the people in the shop that the girls hadn't had a square deal; that if they had been left alone they never would have refused to do the work. They had been encouraged by somebody to refuse to do the work, and had lost their jobs while the people who encouraged them hadn't supported them. Finally the shop chairman and a committee of the employees went to the employer and said: "Take them back," and in a way begged them to do so. Still the employer didn't take them back because they had refused to abide by a decision. Their action was violation of the law. The sentiment grew stronger. The shop chairman went to the manager of the union and said: "You do something to try to get them back. Our people are kicking about it." The manager of the union had all of this sentiment against the firm's stand, which was a right stand, and he knew that any arbitrator would back up the firm. He had that all against him and he knew that no leader can oppose the sentiment of the rank and file very long.

What did he do? Did he tell the shop chairman: "You are wrong, you have violated the law?" No; he said to this radical shop chairman, whom he knew: "You are a great revolutionist! You tell the boss, 'If you don't do so and so, we are going to do this and that and we will walk out.' Then when he calls your bluff you get down on your knees and beg him to take your people back. Why don't you stand up like a man and even though you want them to go back, why don't you say: 'Well, if you don't want us we don't want you. We don't want to go back at all.'" The thing was settled by appealing to that fellow's own revolutionary ideas; his pride that he didn't have to beg the boss to take him back on the

job. That helped to allay all of that spirit of opposition.

So when you approach a class of people you have got to find out their "apperceptive mass," as the psychologists call it. What is the mass of experience in the back of their heads that interprets every word that strikes them? Each person, each group of persons, has a different mass of experience of this kind, and when he hears something, it creates a somewhat different impression from what others get, and you must find out what these different impressions are when you want to get any particular thing over to different people.

One of the most important things that people are afraid of, psychologists will tell you, is the unknown, the fear of change, anything that is unknown. It has been unknown in many clothing factories to count the work that people do, and when you suddenly come and tell people to count the work, they get scared. It is a revolution. No matter how revolutionary they are, they are afraid of change. We had one firm tell the workers: "We want you to count the work." Under our agreement the firm had a right to have its work counted and recorded. But what is the good of a right if the people are afraid of it, as some people may be afraid of lightning or thunder or things of that kind, things they don't know about.

We had a great deal of trouble in the shop of this firm to get the people to count their work. The funny thing about it was when the union official told them: "They have a right to count the work, you cannot object to it. What are you afraid of?" They said: "We don't really object to the counting but what we are afraid of is what that fellow has in mind when he wants us to count the work. We never did it before and he must have something else up his sleeve or else he would never ask us to count the work."

In another shop of the same firm a real revolution was inaugurated by the employer; a system of scientific management was introduced in the shop. It was a complete change from what they had done before, but it wasn't sprung on the workers. It was talked about for two or three months in advance and they learned to know that it was coming and what it was likely to do and they talked back and forth; and this really important revolution in their methods of doing things came about with some grumbling, to be sure, but was accepted without any great amount of